

## REMARKS

It is noted with appreciation that the Examiner allowed claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 11, 16, 18, 20, and 21. He also found allowable matter in dependent claims 13-15, and 19 and would allow these claims if in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim 2 and any intervening claims.

On the other hand, the indicated allowability of claims 2, 12, and 17 was withdrawn and claims 2, 22, and 23 were rejected under 35USC 103 for obviousness over the patent to Rockot 5,793,586 in view of Lofti 6,903,373. Claims 12 and 17 were rejected under 35 USC 103 for obviousness over Rockot in view of Lofti and Gold 5,593,224.

The opportunity afforded by the Examiner for his telephonic interview with inventor Dr. M.J. Hennessy on May 15, 2007, is greatly appreciated. (This interview was previously summarized in the Amendment of May 23, 2007, and that report is repeated here.) At that time the rejection of claim 1 as anticipated by Rockot was discussed. The Examiner's attention was directed to the fact that Rockot provides an interrupter in a DC line and refers only to the major event of opening the switch. Rockot is not intended for and does not describe repetitive switch opening and closing. No agreement was reached regarding claim 1.

Herein, the allowable matter of claim 13 has been included in independent claim 2. Claim 3 was canceled and claim 14 was made dependent on amended claim 2. Accordingly, claim 2 is believed to be allowable together with claims 12, 14, 15, 17, 19 dependent directly or indirectly therefrom.

Additionally the allowable matter of canceled claim 13 has been incorporated by amendment into each of independent claims 22 and 23. Accordingly claims 22 and 23 are respectfully believed to be in condition for allowance.

The rejections of claims for obviousness in view of the cited prior art are rendered moot in view of the above amendments.

An earnest effort has been made to be fully responsive to the Examiner's objections. In view of the above amendments, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance. Every claim is either allowed or contains previously indicated allowable subject matter, or is dependent on such a claim. This amendment does not add new matter. Allowance of this case is earnestly solicited. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, he is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Respectfully submitted,



Leonard Cooper  
Registration No. 27,625  
Attorney for Applicant

999 Grant Avenue  
Pelham Manor, New York 10803  
(914) 738-6276